



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,041	11/30/2000	Endale G. Haile-mariam	HMR-201	8700

7590 06/04/2003

Endale G. Haile-mariam
2712 Henderson Avenue
Wheaton, MD 20902

EXAMINER

BROWN, KHALED

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2877

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/726,041

Applicant(s)

HAILE-MARIAM, ENDALE G.

Examiner

Khaled Brown

Art Unit

2877

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 3-6, 14-18, 24 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 3-6, 14-18, 24 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on 28 September 2001 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 3-6 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gale et al (US 5692820).

Re clm 3: Gale et al discloses a method of creating a projection monitor for use in combination with a personal workspace, permitting an operator to view a computer image in a spatially confined area, the system comprising the steps of: arranging a personal workspace (Gale et al desk Col 2, line 28) having a first operator location and a spatially confined area (Inherently the room where the desk is located); positioning a projector (Gale et al Fig 4), having at least one video input (Gale et al Col 7 line 32) for

Art Unit: 2877

accepting a display signal from a connected computer (Gale et al Col 7 line 40), capable of creating a projected computer image based on the display signal, within the personal workspace and in proximity to the first operator location, directing the projector to project a computer image away from the first operator location and towards a non-transmissive reflective screen (Gale et al Col 6 line 50-56) within the personal workspace (Inherently the room where the users desk is located) and reflecting the computer image from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location (C Gale et al Col 2 lines 1-3).

Re clm 4: delimiting the spatially confined area with at least the reflective screen (Inherent since the screen reduces the total area of the room being used for viewing the projected image)

Re clm 5: operational access to the computer (the user can access the computer)

Re clm 6: placing the projector on a planer work surface (Gale et al users desk Col 2 lines 7-9)

Re clms 24: Gale et al discloses a method of operating a computer system in a personal workspace, permitting an operator to view a computer image in a spatially confined area, in such a manner as to reduce eyestrain (inherent result of using a projector in place of a monitor) comprising: transmitting a display signal from a computer to a projector (Gale et al Col 7 lines 30-50) and having at least one video input (Gale et al Col 7 line 32) for accepting a display signal from a connected computer (Gale et al Col 7 line 40), capable of creating a projected computer image based on the display signal, with the projector positioned in proximity to an operator (must be in proximity so the

Art Unit: 2877

user can see the image) in the personal workspace (Inherently the room where the desk is located) having a first operator location with at least operational access to the computer (Gale et al users desk Col 2 line 9), a spatially confined area (Inherently the room where the desk is located is spatially confined), with a minimum delimitation consisting of the non-transmissive screen (Gale et al Col 6 line 50-56), projecting a computer image away from the first operator location and towards a non-transmissive reflective screen (Gale et al Col 2 line 2 and Col 6 lines 53-56) and reflecting the computer image from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location (Inherent since the user can see the reflected image from the projector).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14-18 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gale et al (US 5692820) in view of Rohr (US 4708312).

Re clms 14: Gale et al discloses a method of creating a projection monitor for use in combination with a personal workspace, permitting an operator to view a computer image in a spatially confined area, comprising the steps of: arranging a personal

Art Unit: 2877

workspace (Gale et al desk Col 2, line 28) having a first operator location and a spatially confined area (Inherently the room where the desk is located); mounting a projector (Gale et al Fig 4), having at least one video input (Gale et al Col 7 line 32) for accepting a display signal from a connected computer (Gale et al Col 7 line 40), capable of creating a projected computer image based on the display signal, within the personal workspace to project a computer image away from the first operator location and towards a reflective screen (Gale et al Col 2 line 2) within the personal workspace, located to receive the computer image from the projector and reflect it towards the first operator location towards the non-transmissive screen (Gale et al Col 6 line 50-56. However, Gale et al does not disclose an adjustable arm connected to the planar work surface within the personal workspace and positioned in proximity to the first operator location. Rohr discloses an adjustable arm (Rohr Fig 1) connected to a planar work surface (Rohr Col 3, line 58) within a personal workspace and positioned in proximity (Rohr Col 1, lines 9-10) to the first operator location that allows a display apparatus/projection monitor to be positioned in all directions with relative ease (Rohr Col 1, line 43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the support of Rohr connected to the desk of Gale et al to support the display apparatus/projection monitor of Gale et al because it would allow the display apparatus/projection monitor to be supported in all directions with relative ease as suggested by Rohr.

Re clm 15: delimiting the spatially confined area with at least the reflective screen
(Inherent since the screen reduces the total area of the room being used for viewing the projected image)

Re clm 16: operational access to the computer (the user can access the computer)

Re clm 17,18: connecting the edge of a planer work surface (Rohr Fig 1 top edge)

Re clms 30: Gale et al discloses a method of operating a computer system in a personal workspace, permitting an operator to view a computer image in a spatially confined area, in such a manner as to reduce eyestrain (inherent result of using a projector in place of a monitor) comprising: transmitting a display signal from a computer to a projector (Gale et al Col 7 lines 30-50) and having at least one video input (Gale et al Col 7 line 32) for accepting a display signal from a connected computer (Gale et al Col 7 line 40), capable of creating a projected computer image based on the display signal, with the projector positioned in proximity to an operator in the personal workspace (Gale et al desk Col 2, line 28) having a first operator location with at least operational access to the computer (Gale et al users desk Col 2 line 9), a spatially confined area (Inherently the room where the desk is located), with a minimum delimitation consisting of the non-transmissive screen (Gale et al Col 6 line 50-56), projecting a computer image away from the first operator location and towards a non-transmissive reflective screen (Gale et al Col 2 line 2 and Col 6 lines 53-56) and reflecting the computer image from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location

However, Gale et al does not disclose an adjustable arm connected to the planar work surface within the personal workspace and positioned in proximity to the first operator

location. Rohr discloses an adjustable arm (Rohr Fig 1) connected to a planar work surface (Rohr Col 3, line 58) within a personal workspace and positioned in proximity (Col 1, lines 9-10) to the first operator location that allows a display apparatus/projection monitor to be positioned in all directions with relative ease (Rohr Col 1, line 43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the support of Rohr connected to the desk of Gale et al to support the display apparatus/projection monitor of Gale et al because it would allow the display apparatus/projection monitor to be supported in all directions with relative ease as suggested by Rohr.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3-4-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Gale et al does not teach, suggest or anticipate a spatially confined, personal workspace (Applicants response entered 3-4-03 p.3 line 27-28, p.10 line 21, p. 14 line 27). However, Gale et al does disclose a spatially confined, personal workspace because Gale et al discloses a desk in a room which is of course a spatially confined, personal workspace (Gale et al Col 2 line 28). The applicant argues that Gale et al does not disclose a non-transmissive reflective screen (Applicants response entered 3-4-03 p.4 lines 1-2, 8-9, p.7 line 13 and 22, p.10 lines 10, 19). However, Gale et al does disclose a non-transmissive reflective screen (Gale et al Col 6 line 50-56). The applicant argues (Applicants response entered 3-4-03 p.3 line 28-30)

Art Unit: 2877

that the screen shown in Gale et al Fig 4 is a transparent screen and not a reflective screen and is not capable of being front or back projected. However, this is not correct since Gale et al discloses a screen (Col 2, line 2, Col 6 line 56) and goes on to say **“The screen can take a number of forms to provide varying degrees of light redirection to accommodate the preferences of a user” (Col 2, line 15) and the screen is capable of being front or back projected (Col 6 line 55). Additionally a front projected system is shown in Fig 4 of Gale et al.** The applicant argues (Applicants response entered 3-4-03 p.5 line 7-10) that Gale et al does not disclose reflecting a computer image from a non-transmissive reflective screen. However, Gale et al does disclose reflecting a computer image from a non-transmissive reflective screen because Gale et al says that the image produced by its projector results from signals received from a computer (Gale et al Col 7 line 32 and Col 7 line 40) and the non-transmissive reflective screen was addressed above. The applicant argues that Gale et al does not disclose an eyestrain reduction method of operating a computer based on a first operator location having operational access to the computer connected to a projector (Applicants response entered 3-4-03 p.7 line 9-11). However, Gale et al does disclose an eyestrain reduction method of operating a computer based on a first operator location having operational access to the computer connected to a projector because Gale et al says that the image produced by its projector results from signals received from a computer and the operator inherently must have operational access to the computer and reduced eyestrain is an inherent result of using a projector in place of a monitor (Gale et al Col 7 line 32 and Col 7 line 40). The applicant argues that Gale et

Art Unit: 2877

al in view of Rohr does not disclose directing a projector to project a computer image while the projector is on an adjustable arm (Applicants response entered 3-4-03 p.9 line 12-14). However, Gale et al in view of Rohr does disclose directing a projector to project a computer image while the projector is on an adjustable arm because the adjustable arm of Rohr is disclosed as being capable of holding a video display apparatus or projection monitor (Rohr Col 1 lines 9-10) such as the one disclosed by Gale et al as noted above. For any other arguments see above rejections.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nasserbakht 5658063.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2877

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khaled Brown whose telephone number is 703-306-5738. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank G. Font can be reached on 703-308-4881. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1782.

KB
May 19, 2003

Frank Font

Art Unit 2877



Frank G. Font
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800